

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-4 are pending in the application and that claims 1-4 are rejected. By this response, claims 1, 2 and 4 have been amended, and new claims 5-20 have been added. Thus, claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on December 2, 2004. During the interview, a general discussion was made of claim 1, including a discussion of additional claim limitations which are presented within newly amended claim 1. More particularly, the provision of feeding fingers and metering fingers relative to the finger knives on the set of overlapping scissor rolls was discussed with the Examiner. No agreement was reached on specific claim language.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C., §103

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *PCT* (WO 95/33566) in view of either *Leach* (U.S. Patent 3,627,211) or *Takahashi, et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,427,321). Independent claim 1 has been amended along with dependent claims 2 and 4. Additionally, new claims 5-20 have also been added.

Amended claim 1 includes limitations of a plurality of feeding fingers and a plurality of metering fingers which are carried by the frame or housing, and which intermesh in

overlapping relation with adjacent pairs of finger knives on the feed scissor roll and the recirculation scissor roll, respectively. Such limitations are also provided in new independent claims 11 and 17.

Amended claims 1, 2 and 4, as well as new claims 5-20, are believed to overcome the obviousness rejection based on the prior art references provided by the Examiner. More particularly, PCT (WO 95/33566) does not teach or suggest the provision of feeding fingers or the provision of metering fingers in relation with a set of overlapping scissor rolls that are counter-rotated and which are fed from below. Furthermore, the provision of a set of overlapping scissor rolls having such construction, and further having the provision of stripping fingers (see claim 2) which restrict a recirculation flow path for delivery of subdivided material solely to a recirculation scissor roll, is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 1-4, and allowance of claims 1-20. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance,

Application Serial No. 10\705,522
Amendment filed 2/3/05 in response
to Office Action dated 9/03/2004

the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such
subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/03/05

By: 

Keith D. Grzelak
Reg. No. 37,144